

11/19/2010

Docket No. 67010-087;
H2699-GC

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appellant: Ronald J. Daley Group Art Unit: 2419
Serial Number: 10/824,819 Examiner: Sefcheck, Gregory B.
Filed: April 15, 2004 Confirmation No.: 6680
Title: Integrated Interface for a Communication System

Commissioner of Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY BRIEF

Dear Sir:

This Reply Brief is submitted in response to the Examiner's Answer mailed September 21, 2010. Appellant will respond to only a few select points, without repeating all of the arguments presented in the Appeal Brief. The following remarks are made in supplement to the Appeal Brief.

Argument

Regarding the Examiner's assertions that control lines 11 and 12 of Figure 1 of Lui are internal communication lines and the Examiner's assertion that the bus repeater 4 of Lui corresponds to the claimed bus repeater and the monitor logic 5 of Lui corresponds to the claimed remote terminal, the Examiner's assertions are contradictory, and therefore his interpretation of Lui is incorrect and the rejection is improper.

The Examiner describes the system illustrated in Figure 1 of Lui as an "integrated" host adapter. The Examiner further establishes this interpretation via his assertion that the control logic provides "internal control of the switching between modes," (see page 15, lines 1-13 of the Examiner's Answer). The Examiner explains that "the only external communication involving the host adapter relates to data passing through the bus repeater portion of the host adapter." It is

therefore apparent that the Examiner considers the host adapter of Lui to be a single, integrated, device.

In the remarks regarding the claimed remote terminal being in direct communication with the bus repeater, however, the examiner interprets monitor logic (5) portion of the host adapter (3) as being a remote terminal. See page 4, paragraphs 3-5 of the Examiner's Answer. The monitor logic (5) of the host adapter cannot be both part of an integrated host adapter and a remote terminal.

Furthermore, the Examiner's argument that the bus repeater contains the monitor logic is directly contradictory to the Examiner's argument that the monitor logic is a remote terminal and control lines 11 and 12 constitute direct communication between the bus repeater and the remote terminal.

The Examiner's interpretation of Lui, upon which he bases his rejection, is impossible due to its inherent contradictions. Therefore, the Examiner's rejection should be vacated.

Closing

For the reasons set forth above, final rejection of claims 1-6, 8, 9 and 11-17 is improper and must be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C.

/Stephen A. Burch/

Stephen A. Burch
Registration No. 66,570
400 W. Maple Road, Ste. 350
Birmingham, MI 48009
Telephone: (248) 988-8360

Dated: November 18, 2010